



Annual Report

The Shawnee County Reentry Program

**Participant Involvement and Outcomes
July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007**

Prepared by:

Margaret Severson*
Associate Professor and Principal Investigator
School of Social Welfare
The University of Kansas

March 31, 2008

* Please address all comments and questions to the author, Margaret Severson, 1545 Lilac Lane; 120 Twente Hall, Lawrence, Kansas 66044 or mseverson@ku.edu

Special thanks to all of the people and organizations listed or referenced below, for their support and assistance in making the Shawnee County Reentry Project a reality!

University of Kansas, School of Social Welfare

Chris Veeh, MSW
Reentry Data Manager

Marianne Berry, Ph.D.
Data Analyst

Kim Bruns, MS.Ed
Justice and Reentry Projects Coordinator

Sarah Potter, CPA
Grants Administrator

Partners:

There are many agency and individual partners who believed in and supported this important project from its inception in 2001.

Kansas Department of Corrections

Roger Werholtz, Secretary
Margie Phelps, Director of Release Planning

Shawnee County Reentry Program Administrators and Staff

Sharidy Fluke, Shawnee County Reentry Program Director
Lea Gerard, Reentry Administrative Specialist
Megan Graves, Case Manager
Deb Klekacz, Reentry Substance Abuse Care Coordinator (Heartland RADAC)
Michelle Montgomery, Program Specialist
Mary Obregon, Case Manager
Lindsay Ronning, Cognitive & Job Specialist
Seyon Washington, Program Coordinator
Dominic Yancy, Police Liaison Officer (Topeka Police Department)

Introduction

The Conception and Development of the Shawnee County Reentry Project

In 2002, reentry-related funding was first received by the Kansas Department of Corrections (KDOC) under the federal agencies' "Going Home" Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative (SVORI). From 2004 through 2006, 66 inmates completed some or all of the Shawnee County Reentry Project (*SCR*P), the pilot reentry program in the state of Kansas.

When the federal funding was largely depleted, the Kansas Legislature and several foundation partners joined together to continue the Shawnee County program by assuming responsibility for fully funding it (as well as other reentry initiatives in the state). Since January 2007, additional funding and technical assistance for continuation and expansion of the reentry efforts in Kansas have been provided to the Kansas Department of Corrections by the JEHT Foundation, the Pew Foundation, the National Institute of Corrections and the Council of State Governments. In spring 2007 the Kansas Legislature made an additional commitment to the development of reentry programming in Kansas by fully funding two additional reentry programs in Sedgwick and Wyandotte Counties. This statewide collaborative effort is entitled the Kansas Offender Risk Reduction and Reentry Plan (KOR³P).

The Shawnee County Reentry Program (*SCR*P) was therefore the forerunner and is now one of several components of the total KOR³P initiative.

Mission Statement

The mission statement of the Shawnee County Reentry Program includes the following language:

"The *SCR*P works to unite community support and providers to assist individuals in effectively transitioning from prison into society as productive, law abiding citizens. Participants work to collaborate with their communities, social support, and families to gain the necessary skills to transition into society and remain crime free."

Criteria for Participation

Target project population: The target *SCRIP* reentry population includes male and female offenders scheduled to return to Shawnee County when their prison terms are completed. In order to qualify for participation in the *SCRIP*, participants must have a minimum of 12 to 18 months remaining on their prison sentences and be identified as posing a high risk to the community for recidivist behaviors. At present, there are no age restrictions for participation in the *SCRIP*. Persons scheduled for post release supervision and those who will not be released under supervision are eligible for the *SCRIP*; thus, offenders leaving the prison may elect to participate in the program even though they are not subject to post-release supervision.

Potential participants who may be returning to Shawnee County are identified by a computer search of release dates, counties of conviction, and the county the individual considered home at the time of his/her incarceration. In addition, potential *SCRIP* participants may also be identified through a system of formal (Kansas Parole Board, correctional officers, Unit Team counselors) as well as informal (other inmates and self-referrals) referrals to the *SCRIP* staff.

Prior evaluation data from the *SCRIP*¹ indicate that those with the highest Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) scores fare better on most of the outcome measures; findings consistent with the risk reduction literature that suggests precious resources are most efficiently expended on and have the most beneficial impact when allocated to those who pose the highest risks for recidivism. Consequently, potential participants' LSI-R composite scores are reviewed and persons with a composite score of 30 or higher are deemed eligible for participation in the

¹ See, Severson, M. (January 8, 2007). Final Report Federal Partners' *Coming Home Initiative: The Shawnee County Reentry Program*; and Severson, M. (January 24, 2008). *Shawnee County Reentry Program Participants' Outcomes at 18 and 24 Months* An Addendum to the Final Report: Federal Partners' *Coming Home Initiative*.

SCRIP. Individuals with LSI-R composite scores of 25 to 30 are also screened for participation on a case-by-case basis by looking at other qualifying variables that may make an individual a candidate for the *SCRIP*, i.e. repeat incarceration, drug/alcohol usage, as well as poor or inadequate education and employment histories.

Under certain conditions offenders who are returned to prison on a violation of the conditions of their release may also be involved in the program. In these cases the offender must have been a past participant of the program. Overall, the *SCRIP* does not target these condition violators for participation and will not accept any condition violators as new participants.

Project Design

Since its inception, the *SCRIP* has operated as a three-phase program, starting while the inmate is incarcerated and continuing through his/her release and reintegration into the community. The focus of the program is largely centered on Phases One and Two; though through the mechanisms of the accountability panels and the alumni services, participants are exposed to the availability of long term supports in Phase Three.

Phase I: Pre-Release Planning. Phase One of the *SCRIP* includes the completion of reentry pre-release assessments and programming which are provided at the Lansing (LCF) (adult male) and the Topeka (TCF) (adult female) Correctional Facilities. Participants are initially identified and enrolled (voluntarily) in the program 12 to 18 months in advance of their scheduled release dates. Every program participant is assigned a case manager immediately upon entry to the program.

Once enrolled in the *SCRIP*, the reentry coordinator and other reentry staff work to design a reintegration regime that corresponds to the inmate's criminogenic risks (as defined by scores on the LSI-R). When identified as areas of need, inmate participants are offered the opportunity

to engage in educational programs, substance abuse and mental health treatment, and job training initiatives.

Some specific and intensive courses are also offered, including employment readiness and development; cognitive classes (*Thinking for a Change*); leisure planning (*Triad Program*); family relations; money management; drug and alcohol education; relapse prevention; housing plans; reentry planning; and limited programming that addresses women's specific needs and concerns.

Phase II: Release Planning and Reintegration. Phase Two of the *SCRIP* involves identifying the resources to which the participants are or will be referred upon their release. This phase has two primary purposes. First, it is to develop a continuum of service provision that follows the offender from the institution into the community and offers offenders the support and the necessary opportunities to succeed. The second purpose is to develop a reentry plan that bridges between the institution and the community; one that is continually updated during the participant's tenure in the program and/or during the time the participant is under criminal justice supervision. During this phase the offender's release plan is established, and s/he meets with the police officer liaison, the parole officer, and the case manager prior to his or her release.

Having already established a relationship while the participant was imprisoned, the same case manager works with the participant once s/he is in the community. Thirty to sixty days after release from prison, the participant meets with his/her Accountability Panel – a panel of community representatives who come together to review the participant's reentry plan and to support the participant's progress in the *SCRIP*. The participant may ask his/her family, friends and other supports to attend the Accountability Panel meetings to participate in the process and interact, though they are not formal members of the Panel.

Throughout the six month period of official reentry programming that occurs in the community during Phase Two, the participant's case manager, his/her parole officer, the police officer liaison, and the accountability panel work closely together to provide effective, safe, and supportive supervision of the participant. Moreover, the participant is directed to intensive job services, community services, mentoring, and support programs as needed.

Phase III: Community Based Long Term Supports. Phase Three of the *SCRIP* is focused on supporting the offender's crime-free life in the community, lived as a responsible and productive citizen. In this phase, long-term supports are established and linkages to community, educational, and other naturally occurring resources are secured. Included in this phase is an alumni services program, a program offered to successful *SCRIP* graduates which entails periodic gatherings and certain specialized services. In the reporting period ending July 1, 2007, there are five individual participants who have received alumni services.

Staffing

The current staffing of the *SCRIP* include one program director; two case managers; one facility based reentry coordinator; a program specialist who focuses on the recruitment of volunteers, victim-related and community-service programming, and the involvement of the participant's family; an administrative specialist; one police officer liaison, one facility based Job/Cognitive specialist, and access to a housing resource specialist. Staff of the *SCRIP* may provide reentry preparatory services to participants – especially women - being released to Sedgwick County, where another formal reentry program is now in operation.

The Program Evaluation

In accord with the mandates of the Kansas Department of Corrections, a data collection system has been designed that will yield information about relationships between certain defined

participant and program elements and ultimate outcomes, including the three recidivism measures of parole violations, new charges and returns to prison.

Every current participant is expected to sign a program agreement and an informed consent statement prior to his/her enrollment in the *SCRIP*. Participants are aware that data will be collected while they are active in the program and that they will be asked to complete periodic satisfaction surveys designed to provide information about their perceptions of their experiences in the *SCRIP*.

The *SCRIP* administrative specialist and the case managers have the responsibility and have been trained to input the data about each participant.

The final outcomes reported here include findings on recidivism, program participation, both before and after release to the community, housing stability, and job attainment and retention. They are final outcomes in the sense that they report on all *SCRIP* participants actively enrolled in the program as of July 1, 2006 and all those enrolled between that date and June 30, 2007. Many of the participants who completed or terminated their participation in the *SCRIP* prior to June 30, 2006 are the subjects of two prior program evaluations and thus are not included in the data reported here.²

Periodic data reviews and data analysis are completed and will continue at regular intervals in order to verify the accuracy of the data and report on the progress of the Shawnee County Reentry Program and its participants.

Analysis and Findings

² See, Severson, M. (January 8, 2007). Final Report Federal Partners' *Coming Home Initiative: The Shawnee County Reentry Program*; and Severson, M. (January 24, 2008). *Shawnee County Reentry Program Participants' Outcomes at 18 and 24 Months* An Addendum to the Final Report: Federal Partners' *Coming Home Initiative*.

The analysis detailed in the following pages will focus in part on describing the participants enrolled and the services provided in both of the formal reentry programs currently in operation in Kansas and in part solely on the *SCRIP* participants . Because these are two different programs – staff, program offerings, services in the community, and time in operation all differ between them – they are in many ways incomparable. On the other hand, it seems important to see the reentry mission both in whole and in part; consequently, this analysis provides a birds-eye view of the activities of the reentry programs and then a more detailed view of the *SCRIP*. This analysis does not compare the Shawnee and Sedgwick County programs; therefore, no statistical tests of variance were performed.

Certain analytic decisions were necessary prior to generating these statistical data and findings. First, several participants in both programs are on their second or third reentry program experiences. While we believe and the research supports that multiple exposures to reentry programming are likely to occur as part of the natural course of relapse and recovery, and are good for the participant, there are not yet sufficient numbers of participants who have had multiple exposures to reentry programming to allow us to analyze their activities and outcomes outside of the one-exposure group. Over time we expect to be able to separate these repeat participants out and consequently to be able to provide more information about the impact of program dosage (how often one receives an intervention) and duration (how long the intervention is provided) on the targeted outcomes.

Second, two participants in the Shawnee program died prior to program completion. Because both of these participants ended their program participation prior to their deaths (one graduated and the other terminated from the program while involved in the community portion of it), they are included in the descriptive statistics and in certain correlation analyses.

Third, when creating the four categories denoting level of program participation certain judgments were required. In many cases, only “end” dates (as opposed to graduation dates) were provided by the program staff. However, a review of the data on each participant with an end date made it clear that the participant had achieved a certain level of participation in the reentry program. Our standards for determining, where necessary, the level of achievement for participants with end dates are explained in the analysis / findings section of this report.

Finally, the data reported here are taken from a variety of sources including police reports, progress reports from community organizations, class completion certificates, participant self-reports, participants’ case files, and / or chronological notes made by the case manager in the Total Offender Activity Documentation System (TOADS).

Research staff developed and trained case management staff on the computer databases used to track all participant and program information. These data are entered by a number of individuals, and therefore require careful scrutiny. Data in this database were checked repeatedly for their congruence with case files and other information from KDOC, prior to and during data analysis. However, given the low numbers of responses to some questions, there are concerns about the reliability of some of the data. These will be noted throughout the analysis, but raise questions as to the veracity and/or accuracy of the data.

Demographic, Family and Mental Health Characteristics of Program Participants

There are 141 program participants included in the evaluation of the Shawnee County program. Overall, program participants at both reentry sites ranged in age from 19 to the mid-60s. The mean age of the participants was in the thirties. Roughly two-thirds to three-quarters of program participants were male, with more women enrolled in the *SCRIP* than in the Sedgwick program. About half of program participants were white, and half were African American. The

majority of participants said that they did not have a significant other (spouse or intimate partner) at program entry, but did have children. The mean number of children per participant, among those with children, was three children for those in the *SCRIP* and two children for those in the Sedgwick program. The higher number of children for those enrolled in the *SCRIP* is no doubt due to the number of women served by that program.

One-third of the participants in the *SCRIP* report having child support obligations; fewer in Sedgwick County reported the same. Very small proportions of the program groups reported having a history of either perpetrating or being a victim of domestic violence. These low rates of child support obligations and domestic violence histories raise concerns (for us and for program staff) about the reliability of these data.

About half of the program participants were reported to need time-limited mental health services while incarcerated. Smaller proportions were said to need ongoing mental health services and/or medications, special needs mental health treatment or mental health reintegration services at the Larned Mental Health Correctional Facility or the Lansing Correctional Facility – Treatment Unit (LCF-TRU).

Table 1: Demographic, Family and Mental Health Characteristics of Program Participants

	Sedgwick County (n=170)	Shawnee County (n=141)
Mean age in 2007	37.1 yrs.	34.5 yrs.
Median age	37.3 yrs.	33.4 yrs.
Range of ages	19 to 62 yrs.	22 to 66 yrs.
	%	%
Gender		
Male	79%	69%
Female	21%	31%
Ethnicity		
White	49%	45%
African American	48%	52%
Native American	1%	1%
Hispanic ³	1%	1%
Asian American	0	1%
Multiracial	1%	0%
At Program Entry		
Has significant other	30%	36%
Has children	54%	73%
Mean number of children *	1 child	2 children
Mean number of children, parents only	2 children	3 children
Has Existing Child Support Obligation⁴	14%	34%
History of Domestic Violence	4%	11%
Mental Health Code at KDOC Entry		
Not currently requiring MH services	0	0
May require time-limited MH services	49%	49%
Requires ongoing MH services +/- meds	14%	18%
Requires special needs treatment	18%	18%
Requires MH reintegration at LCF-TRU	19%	13%
Requires Intensive Srvcs. Larned/Lansing	1%	2%

* Calculation of mean among total sample, including those without children.

³ The KDOC does not separate persons of Hispanic ethnicity from those listed as White. This data element is based on self-report to the reentry program staff. Consequently, the actual percentages of Hispanic reentry participants are probably higher.

⁴ The child support information for Sedgwick participants is thought to reflect underreporting of data.

Criminogenic Characteristics of Participants at Program Entry

About two-thirds of program participants had at least one conviction for a violent crime. The majority of those with this history had either one or two violent crime convictions.

The average length of current sentence was approximately 5.5 years in each program. The median length of sentence is a more appropriate reflection of sentences for these populations, because the mean length of sentence is inflated by the very few participants with a life sentence. The median length of the current sentence is about four years, meaning that half of program participants had shorter sentences than four years, and half had longer sentences.

We recorded the LSI-R composite and domain scores at or near program entry for all participants. The LSI-R can be and is administered several times over the course of an inmate's sentence and post-release supervision. To reflect the level of criminogenic risk in this sample prior to program participation, we selected the LSI-R score for each individual that was prior to and closest to the date they began the Reentry program.

For the time period of July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007, the composite scores of 26 for the Shawnee and 31 for the Sedgwick County programs on the LSI-R were determined to represent medium high and high risk levels, respectively. The domains with the highest scores are criminal history, education/employment, and alcohol / drug use. LSI-R domain scores are roughly comparable between Shawnee County and Sedgwick participants.

Table 2: Criminogenic Characteristics of Participants at Program Entry

	Sedgwick County (n=170)	Shawnee County (n=141)
Mean Number of Violent Convictions	1 conviction	1 conviction
Number of Violent Convictions		
None	39%	32%
One	28%	26%
Two	18%	25%
Three	10%	7%
Four or more	5%	10%
Mean Number of Months of Sentence	67.8 mos.	65.3 mos.
Median Number of Months of Sentence	46.5 mos.	50.0 mos.
Number of Months of Sentence		
1 to 11	0	3%
12 to 23	1%	6%
24 to 35	27%	26%
36 to 47	24%	13%
48 to 59	15%	21%
60 to 71	13%	10%
72 to 720	20%	20%
Life sentence	1%	1%
Mean LSIR Scores at/near Prog. Entry †	(n=170)	(n=52)*
Composite	31	26
Education / Employment	7	6
Criminal History	7	7
Alcohol / Drug	4	3
Companions	3	3
Attitude / Orientation	3	1
Family / Marital	2	2
Emotional	2	2
Leisure	2	1
Financial	1	1
Accommodation	1	1

† We have included only those participants who have LSI-R scores administered between 18 months prior to their program start date and 1 year post-start date, and have used the LSI-R score from the assessment closest to their program start date, and prior to their release date.

* A reentry program has been in operation in Shawnee County since 2003, and the participants in that program have had multiple assessments on the LSI-R. When we established the criteria above for selection of participants' LSI-R score, the pool of valid LSI-R scores "at or near program entry" was reduced to those for 52 Shawnee County participants whose dates of LSI-R assessment fell within those time boundaries.

Program Entry and Departure

The *SCRIP* program began accepting participants in the last half of 2003 and the Sedgwick County program began accepting participants in early 2006. It should be noted that most of the 66 participants who were the subjects of the first *SCRIP* report are not included in this quantitative analysis. Those who were still active in the program as of July 1, 2006 and those who have had a new program experience are included in this analysis.⁵ Consequently, when looking at the total number of participants served, the *SCRIP* population (n=141) appears to include fewer people than does the Sedgwick County program (n=170), but that is only because of the population groups being reported on here.

In the *SCRIP* sample, there are 79 participants (56% of total sample) with a recorded release date. The average length of time in the program prior to release from prison was a little over one year (395 days). About one half of those released had spent 12 to 18 months in the program prior to their release from prison.

In the *SCRIP*, there are 65 participants (46%) with a recorded date for ending participation in the program. Among those who have ended the program, the average length of time in the program is 469 days or roughly 15 months. Approximately 37% of those who ended the program had spent more than 18 months in the program. At this time, there are insufficient data that prevent a similar analysis on Sedgwick participants.

⁵ For information about these 66 original participants, see the reports referenced in footnote #1.

Table 3: Program Entry and Departure

	Sedgwick County (n=170)	Shawnee County (n=141)	Shawnee Co. with Release Date and Program End Date (n=54)
Started in Program*			
July-Dec 2003	0	1%	2%
Jan-June 2004	0	1%	2%
July-Dec 2004	0	5%	11%
Jan-June 2005	0	21%	43%
July-Dec 2005	0	18%	26%
Jan-June 2006	24%	15%	11%
July-Dec 2006	43%	21%	4%
Jan-June 2007	34%	18%	1%
Days in Program Prior to Release **	Unavailable	(n=79)	(n=54)
Mean		395 days	378 days
Less than 90 days		0	0
91 to 180 days		8%	11%
181 to 365 days		32%	33%
366 to 545 days		48%	41%
546 to 730 days		10%	13%
731 to 811 days		1%	2%
812 + days		1%	0
Total Days in Program ***		(n=65)	(n=54)
Mean		469 days	507 days
Less than 90 days		9%	7%
91 to 180 days		9%	6%
181 to 365 days		15%	15%
366 to 545 days		25%	26%
546 to 730 days		26%	31%
731 to 811 days		11%	11%
812 + days		5%	6%

* There are 12 inmates who participated in the program multiple times (eleven did the program two times, and one did the program three times).

** Days between program start date and date of release from facility; calculated for those inmates with a recorded "release date." There are currently insufficient data for Sedgwick participants to allow for computation.

*** Days between program start date and program end date; calculated for those inmates with a recorded "program end date."

Program Participation in Shawnee County

There is a range of services available to program participants and service type and provision varies by the respective county reentry program. Consequently, program participation data are discussed below. We report here the proportions of participants who: (1) have participated in and completed the service, (2) started the service but quit before completion, (3) were referred to the service but did not attend, and (4) were participating in the service (as of July 1, 2007), when recidivism outcomes were collected.

Service completion rates are higher than rates for those who started and quit the service or were referred to a service but did not attend. In other words, it appears that participants who begin a service are likely to complete it.

About one-third of program participants were assessed for substance abuse. Fewer than five participants were reported to have been assessed for their mental health service needs. A reassessment for mental health service needs is done for purposes of reentry planning only if the participant has been previously identified and assigned a code which suggests s/he has significant mental health needs.

The services/classes with the highest completion rates are the reentry planning class (64%), money management (43%), employment (40%), education workshop (33%), and housing workshop (29%). Smaller proportions completed the cognitive thinking class (24%) or the family transition class (24%).

Nearly 17 percent of the Shawnee participants completed program components available only on an intermittent or selective basis, such as a Loss and Bereavement Group, Therapeutic Community, the Labette Boot Camp (women only), Second Chance class, parenting class, nutrition classes and other classes labeled “miscellaneous” in Table 4 below.

The completion rates for the cognitive thinking class (24%) and cognitive counseling (27%) are roughly similar. Because a participant's "counseling" experience includes one-time interactions with a case manager, there are no meaningful non-completion rates.

Few participants are reported to have begun a class and quit. The class with the highest non-completion rate is the money management class (9%). The class with the highest rate of participants referred to the class but not attending is the cognitive thinking class. The housing workshop also has a sizeable proportion of participants who were referred to the service but did not attend (13%).

Few participants completed courses in education or substance abuse, workshops on family transition, child support or employment, or counseling for education, employment or housing. Also, very few participants were involved in community-based substance abuse services. Community-based substance abuse services also have the highest non-completion rate.

There were no participants reported to be in faith-based services in the *SCRIP*.

Table 4: **Program Participation, Shawnee County Only (n=141) ***

	Completed	Started, Quit	Referred, did not attend	In Process
Assessments				
Substance Abuse Assessment	39%		14%	2%
Vocational Rehabilitation Assessment	7%		3%	
Classes				
Reentry Planning Class	64%	3%	7%	1%
Money Management	43%	9%	7%	4%
Employment Class	40%	7%	11%	
Cognitive Class	24%	4%	17%	3%
Family Transition Class	24%	4%	10%	
Education GED	4%	4%	1%	4%
Education FAFSA	4%			
Substance Abuse Class	4%			
Workshops				
Education Workshop	33%		9%	1%
Housing Workshop	29%		13%	
Parole Interaction Workshop	12%			
AIDS Education Workshop	11%			
Family Transition Workshop	6%		5%	0.7%
Child Support Workshop	6%		3%	
Employment Workshop	4%			
Counseling – Individual Case Mgt				
Cognitive Counseling	27%			
Education Counseling	3%			
Employment Counseling	4%			
Housing Counseling	4%			
Reentry Counseling	3%			
Substance Abuse Counseling	2%			
Community Based				
Substance Abuse – Community Based	6%	9%	5%	1%
Mental Health – Community-Based	1%	1%	3%	2%
Miscellaneous				
Miscellaneous	16%			
Vo-Tech	5%			

* Raw numbers for program participation must total at least 5 participants for class/service to be included in table. There was no participation in Faith-Based services in Shawnee County.

Program Participation Preparing for Release to Community

This section discusses participant use of reentry services that are typically provided prior to release from prison. In some cases, such as matching participants to community connectors, the service could have actually occurred post-release. Our data files do not include the date that each of these services was provided; they are grouped in this table as those typically assessed or provided prior to release.

In the *SCRIP*, 100 percent of participants were reported to have a signed program agreement, and 82 percent were said to have an individual reentry plan. Very few participants (6%) had a safety plan included in their individual reentry plan. Safety plans are not expected to be included in every reentry plan.

Almost half of all participants in the *SCRIP* were reported not to need a community connector (48%). Another quarter of participants were referred to a community connector, but this referral did not result in a match. Small proportions of participants were matched (6%) or referred and matched (3%) to a community connector.

The vast majority of program participants in the *SCRIP* were released from the facilities in Lansing (65%) and Topeka (33%).

Case managers were asked to indicate whether program participants would have a variety of assets and supports at their release. Only small proportions of participants have one or more assets or supports at release to the community, including state-issued identification (45%), available public transportation (34%) and/or a birth certificate (25%).

The social support reported for the largest number of program participants was that from family (39%). Other supports, such as Alcohol/Narcotics Anonymous (12%) and a community mental health center (9%) were less common.

Table 5: Program Participation Preparing for Release to Community

	Shawnee County (n= 141)	
	%	Raw Numbers
Signed Program Agreement	100%	141
Had Individual Reentry Plan	83%	115
Individual Plan contains a Safety Plan	6%	8
Matched to Community Connector		
Referred and matched	3%	5
Referred only	27%	38
Matched only	6%	8
Not needed	48%	68
No information at this time	16%	22
Released from Facility:		
Lansing	65%	91
Topeka	33%	46
Wichita Work Release	1%	1
Hutchinson	1%	1
Osawatomie	1%	1
Ellsworth	1%	1
Unknown	0	0
El Dorado	0	0
Winfield	0	0
At Release to Community:		
Has ID	45%	64
Has Birth Certificate	25%	35
Public bus	34%	48
Walking	9%	13
Car	5%	7
Carpool	4%	6
Bicycle	1%	1
Has Support upon Release from:		
Family	39%	55
AA/NA	12%	17
Community Mental Health Center	9%	13
Community Support Group	6%	8
Spouse	5%	7
Church	4%	6
Peers	1%	2
None	5%	7

Program Participation During Release to Community

Case managers kept track of the contacts that program participants had with program personnel during or related to the community portion of the program. These contacts include Transition Team meetings, which are done prior to release, in preparation for release. We include them in this discussion of the community portion, because they are meaningful only for those participants who have been released. In addition to information about meeting with Transition Teams, program personnel recorded whether participants met with Accountability Panels, Police Liaison Officers, and Law Enforcement Officers, and for what reasons. In this analysis of community service participation, we report only on those individuals who had been released to the community as of July 1, 2007 (n=75).

The majority of released participants met with a Transition Team at least once. In Shawnee County, almost equal numbers of participants had a Transition Team meeting held six months and 30 days prior to expected release. In Sedgwick County, the Team meeting held six months prior to the expected release date was the one most commonly attended. Sedgwick County also holds Transition Team meetings at 90 days after signing the program agreement, and over half of released participants attended this meeting. There is no 90-day Transition Team meeting in Shawnee County.

The program also provides for Accountability Panels that consist of community representatives who come together with the participant to review the participant's reentry plan and to support his / her progress in the reentry program. Appearance in front of the panel may also be used as a sanction for a participant who is struggling. In that event, the panel meets with the participant and then recommends certain time-limited goals that the participant must achieve if s/he is to avoid more serious consequences. In Shawnee County, over half of released

participants met with an Accountability Panel upon release (60%), and many also attended a panel for risky behavior (28%) and/or for program graduation (28%). Meeting with an Accountability Panel to discuss the success of the program participant occurred for one participant, in Shawnee County. Sedgwick County participants are most likely to have met with an Accountability Panel for their initial contact at release (30%), but rarely attend any others.

The records for these programs also indicate whether participants met with their Police Officer Liaison, and for what purpose. In these records, Transition Team meetings can again be noted, but from the perspective of whether the Police Officer Liaison was involved in the meeting. The most common contact between the Police Officer Liaison and program participants was at the Transition Team meeting held six months prior to expected release (56% in Shawnee County; 52% in Sedgwick County).

In Shawnee County, many program participants met with the Police Officer Liaison at the Transition Team meeting six months prior (56%) or 30 days prior (52%) to their expected release. Less commonly noted were the initial contact with the Police Officer Liaison (23%), meetings with an Accountability Panel (24%), and meetings of a non-criminal nature (17%). Given that such meetings are encouraged, it seems plausible that many of these contacts occurred but were not entered into the database. Again, these low rates of contact raise questions as to the reliability of the data.

Program personnel were also asked to note any contacts between law enforcement officers and program participants. In Shawnee County, about one-quarter of released program participants (24%) had been in contact with a law enforcement officer for a misdemeanor charge or an unspecified reason (21%). Also noted for some participants were contacts with law

enforcement officers for traffic violations (17%) or parole violations (16%). Few arrest warrants were noted in the database.

Table 6: Program Participation During Release to Community

	Sedgwick County (n=23)		Shawnee County (n= 75) *	
	%	Raw #	%	Raw #
Transition Team Meetings				
Met six months prior to expected release	78%	18	63%	47
Met 90 days prior to expected release	57%	13	NA	NA
Met 30 days prior to expected release	30%	7	64%	48
Accountability Panels				
Initial Release Panel	30%	7	60%	48
Risky Behavior	9%	2	28%	21
Graduation	9%	2	28%	21
Success	0	0	1%	1
Police Liaison Officer Contacts				
Six month Transition Team	52%	12	56%	44
Non-Criminal	44%	10	17%	13
30 day Transition Team	30%	7	52%	39
Initial Contact	17%	4	23%	17
Accountability Panel	16%	6	24%	18
Participant Initiated	13%	3	5%	4
Arrest	4%	1	1%	1
Agency Initiated	NA	NA	11%	8
Other	NA	NA	4%	3
Law Enforcement Officer Contacts				
Traffic	9%	2	17%	13
Domestic Violence	4%	1	3%	2
Victim	0	0	3%	2
Drugs/DUI	0	0	NA	NA
Misdemeanor	NA	NA	24%	18
Parole Violation	NA	NA	16%	12
Felony	NA	NA	7%	5
Other	0	0	21%	16
Type of Arrest Warrant				
Parole Violation	0	0	7%	5
County	0	0	5%	4

* Table includes two deceased participants enrolled in the Shawnee County program, who died after release from prison. These individuals did participate in post-release services, so they are included in this table.

Program Outcomes

Program Participation

We were able to categorize the 75 participants who had been released to the community before July 1, 2007 as to their level of completion of the *SCRIP*. Four levels of completion were identified for all the persons who were identified as having an official “start” data: (1) completed some of the in-prison programming; (2) completed all of the in-prison programming; (3) completed all of the in-prison and some of the community programming; and (4) completed the entire reentry program, including all of the in-prison and all of the community programming requirements. For analyses purposes, these categories were later regrouped into three defined levels of completion: those who started but did not complete the in-prison program; those who completed all of the in-prison and some or none of the community program; and those who completed the entire *SCRIP*.

Of the 75 released program participants, almost half (45%) had completed the full program: both the pre-release and the community portion of the program. Another 33 percent had completed all of the pre-release portion of the program, and had participated in some, but not all of the community portion. An additional 7 percent had completed all of the pre-release portion, but had not participated in community components of the program. Therefore, a total of 85% of released participants had completed the pre-release portion of *SCRIP* prior to their release. Finally, 15 percent did not complete the pre-release component of *SCRIP* services.

Recidivism

The KDOC provided data on new charges, new violations and new admissions to prison for all program participants, as of July 1, 2007. The date of the return to prison, and related violations and charges were recorded for each participant with a recidivism outcome. From

these dates, we calculated how long the person had been in the community between their date of release from the facility and their new violations, charges and/or returns to prison.

In addition to these data on recidivism, we also collected information on other indicators of success in the community, including housing stability, job attainment and job stability.

We were also provided a list of 54 KDOC inmates who were assessed as being eligible for participation in the *SCRIP* but who for some reason did not enroll. We have evaluated this group of eligible non-participants on their ultimate recidivism outcomes as a comparison group against which the *SCRIP* participant outcomes can be viewed.

As of July 1, 2007, 75 of the *SCRIP* program participants had been released to the community. We examined the recidivism outcomes for each released participant, and noted how many months prior to July 1, 2007 they had been released. This allows us to report the recidivism outcomes for those who had been released only within the past six months, within the past year, within the past 18 months, and within the past 2 years. When we report recidivism outcomes in Tables 7A and 7B, the sample sizes of those who have been released change over time (everyone has been in the community for at least some portion of the 6 months prior to July 1, 2007, but as the categories change to those who have been out 6 months or more, to 12 months or more, to 18 months or more, the samples of participants get smaller). We report recidivism outcomes that occurred for participants in each specific time period.

Seventy-five *SCRIP* released participants had been released to the community prior to July 1, 2007. The recidivism rate, or returns to prison, in the first six months following their release date was eight (8) percent. These returns to prison were all related to new violations. There were no new charges for participants within the first six months of their release. Among a comparable sample of inmates released to Shawnee County who were not enrolled in the

program (n=54), the rate of new violations by six months post-release was 11%, and the rate of returns to prison was 11%.

In July, 2007, 50 program participants had been released to the community between 181 days to 365 days (one year) prior to July 1, 2007, when recidivism outcomes were recorded. Of these, eight (16%) had new violations during 180 days to 365 days post-release, two (4%) had new charges, and eight (16%) had a new prison entry in that period. Therefore, a new violation was sufficient for a return to prison for six of the eight recidivists, and new charges resulted in a return to prison for two participants during this period. The comparison group in Shawnee County (n=53) had a rate of 8 percent of non-enrolled inmates with new violations and 8 percent with returns to prison during this period of time following their release from prison.

Only 29 *SCRIP* participants had been released to the community at least 366 days up to 18 months prior to July 1, 2007. Of these, three *SCRIP* participants (10%) had a new violation and a new entry to prison in the period of 12.1 to 18 months post-release. One of these three also received new charges in this period, and two returned to prison based on the new violation. In the Shawnee County non-enrolled comparison group (n=48), two percent had new violations recorded during this period after release, and two percent had returns to prison.

Among those seven *SCRIP* participants whose release date was between 18.1 months and 24 months prior to July 1, 2007 there were no new violations, charges or admissions to prison reported in the period of 18.1 to 24 months post-release. In the Shawnee County comparison group (n=33), there were rates of six percent new violations and six percent returns to prison.

In total, there are 17 recidivists (those who returned to prison) in the population of 75 *SCRIP* participants who had been released to the community prior to July 1, 2007, when

recidivism outcomes were studied. This represents an overall recidivism rate of 23% among those who had any participation in the *SCRIP* program.

The overall recidivism rate for those who had completed the entire *SCRIP* program (pre-release and full community component; n=34 or 45%) is one person out of 34, or 3%, while the recidivism rate for those who completed the pre-release portion but only some or none of the community component is thirteen out of 30 participants, or 43%. Of the eleven *SCRIP* participants who did not complete the pre-release portion of the program, three (27%) were returned to prison once released.

Out of the total comparison sample of those in Shawnee County not enrolled in the *SCRIP* program (n=54), a total of 13 (24%) had some form of new violations, charges and/or returns to prison post-release. This recidivism rate falls between the 3% rate for Shawnee Full Completers and 43% for Shawnee County partial completers, and may be somewhat explained by the possibility that the partial *SCRIP* completers were under more scrutiny as a function of program participation than were inmates in the non-enrolled comparison group.

Table 7A: *SCR*P Program Recidivism Outcomes

	Shawnee County Enrolled in <i>SCR</i>P	Shawnee Not Enrolled
	(n=75)	(n=54)
Released to community	(n=75)	(n=54)
New violations in months in first six months out	6 or 8%	6 or 11%
New charges	0	0
New admissions	6 or 8%	6 or 11%
Released to community at least 181 days prior to 7/1/2007	(n=50)	(n=53)
New violations in months 6.1 to 12	8 or 16%	4 or 8%
New charges	2 or 4%	0
New admissions	8 or 16%	4 or 8%
Released to community at least 366 days prior to July 1, 2007	(n=29)	(n=48)
New violations in months 12.1 to 18	3 or 10%	1 or 2%
New charges	1 or 3%	0
New admissions	3 or 10%	1 or 2%
Released to community at least 545 days prior to July 1, 2007	(n=7)	(n=33)
New violations in months 18.1 and higher	0	2 or 6%
New charges	0	0
New admissions	0	2 or 6%

Table 7B: *SCR*P Program Recidivism Outcomes by Program Completion *

	Shawnee County Enrolled in <i>SCR</i> P (n=75)	Level of Program Participation		
		Completed Full Program (n= 34)	Completed Pre-Release and some or no Community (n=30)	Did not Complete Pre- Release (n=11)
Released to community				
New violations in first six mos.	6 or 8%	1 or 3%	5 or 17%	0
New charges	0	0	0	0
New admissions	6 or 8%	1 or 3%	5 or 17%	0
Released to community at least 181 days prior to 7/1/2007	(n=50)	(n= 20)	(n=23)	(n=7)
New violations in months 6.1 to 12	8 or 16%	0	7 or 30%	1 or 14%
New charges	2 or 4%	0	2 or 9%	0
New admissions	8 or 16%	0	7 or 30%	1 or 14%
Released to community at least 366 days prior to July 1, 2007	(n=29)	(n=10)	(n=14)	(n=5)
New violations in months 12.1 to 18	3 or 10%	0	1 or 7%	2 or 40%
New charges	1 or 3%	0	0	1 or 20%
New admissions	3 or 10%	0	1 or 7%	2 or 40%
Released to community at least 545 days prior to July 1, 2007	(n=7)	(n=0)	(n=6)	(n=1)
New violations in months 18.1 and higher	0	0	0	0
New charges	0	0	0	0
New admissions	0	0	0	0
Overall recidivism rates	24%	3%	43%	27%

* The rates reported are unique to each time period; they are not cumulative.

Other Participant Outcomes

There is a range of other activities and improvements, besides recidivism, tracked by this research that could be indications of the influence of the *SCRIP* program on participants. We also examined the following: job attainment and retention, length of job retention, housing stability in the community, and changes in LSI-R scores over time.

Table 8: *SCRIP* Program Outcomes other than Recidivism by Program Completion **

	Shawnee County Total (n=75)	Level of Program Participation	
		Completed Full Program (n=34)	Completed Pre-Release and Some or No Community (n=30)
Obtained a job	59%	74%	63%
Job Retention (among the employed)	32%	44%	16%
Avg. length of time in job, for those who lost job	65 days	79 days	52 days
	(n=35)	(n=15)	(n=18)
Mean number of housing changes in 1 st yr.	1 change	1 change	1 change
	(n=10)	(n=3)	(n=7)
Mean change in LSI-R score	+2.9 pts.	-2.3 pts	+6.6 pts.

** The reader is cautioned to note the reduced sample sizes for these program outcomes. A very large proportion of participants are missing data on these items, making interpretation of results difficult. Because of so much missing data for those who did not complete the pre-release portion of the program, they are not included in this table.

Participant and Service Characteristics Related to Recidivism Outcomes

For the analysis of outcomes in Shawnee County, we collapsed the recidivism outcomes into one variable: had the participant re-entered prison after being released to the community or not. We conducted cross-tabulations between key characteristics of participants and services and recidivism, as defined above, producing chi-square statistics. The following characteristics are statistically associated with a lower likelihood of return to prison. The reader is cautioned that

these analyses are performed on the sample of 75 participants who have been released. Small samples are unlikely to find statistical relationships, simply because of the lack of statistical power.

Demographic and Criminogenic Characteristics

There is no relationship between a return to prison and a participant's age, number of children, whether s/he has a spouse, has an existing child support obligation or a history of domestic violence as a victim or perpetrator. The level of mental health need was also not related to subsequent program success (as measured by return to prison).

There is a small connection between gender and program success. The women who participated in the program had a recidivism rate of 11%, compared to a recidivism rate of 29% among the men ($p < .10$). Also, African-American participants had the highest recidivism rate, at 33%, compared to 10% for white participants and 0% for Native Americans.

A subsequent return to prison is not related to the participant's number of prior violent convictions or length of current sentence. There are no differences in the LSI-R score at program entry between those who eventually return to prison.

While there was no significant difference between ultimately successful and unsuccessful program participants in the first LSI-R scores, the second LSI-R scores (taken later in program participation) were somewhat lower (mean of 27.9 points) for those who did not return to prison than for those who did (mean LSI-R score of 38.0 points; $p < .12$). The largest decline was in the Attitude domain, where the difference between the second LSI-R scores was a mean of 1.6 for non-recidivists vs. 3.5 for recidivists ($p < .05$). In essence, an improvement in LSI-R scores over the course of the *SCRIP* program, especially in Attitude, was predictive of success – defined as not returning to prison after release.

The lack of most demographic and criminogenic or mental health issues being related to program outcomes sets a good baseline from which to analyze program impacts. Because the personal characteristics of participants do not appear to influence outcomes, the influence of program components on outcomes are more easily determined, without having to parse out the contribution of personal characteristics.

Pre-Release Case Management Services

Program success was not related to the number of classes completed by the participant in the *SCRIP* nor was the completion of any specific class related to lower recidivism rates. However, those who returned to prison were more likely to have taken the Cognitive Class and/or talked to their case manager individually about cognitive concerns, than had or were successful participants.

Meeting with a Transition Team at either six months or 30 days prior to expected release was highly significantly related to lower recidivism rates. Those who had met with a six-months- prior-to-release Transition Team had a 15 percent recidivism rate, compared to 36 percent among those who had not ($p < .05$). Those who had met with a 30-day Transition Team had a recidivism rate of 13 percent, compared to a recidivism rate of 41 percent among those who had not ($p < .05$).

Post-Release Community Contacts

Participants were far less likely to return to prison if they had met with an Initial Accountability Panel ($p < .05$) and/or if their Police Liaison attended their Accountability Panel ($p < .01$). Recidivism rates were also lower among those who had attended an Accountability Panel for Graduation (5% recidivism rate), and higher among those who had attended an

Accountability Panel for Risky Behavior (43% recidivism rate). Both relationships are statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Finally, while not statistically significant, it is notable that program participants who avoided returning to prison had spent an average of two months longer in the *SCRIP* than had those who returned to prison. Successful participants had spent an average of 523 days (about 18 months) in the program, compared to an average program duration of 467 days (about 15 months) for those who returned to prison.

Survey Responses

A satisfaction survey is provided to each participant prior to their release from the prison into the community portion of the reentry program. The participant is given an envelope to send the completed survey to the University of Kansas evaluation staff. Because there is some time delay in receiving the completed surveys, in this section we provide both historical and recent data about the survey responses. These findings should be viewed with caution since over time, only a small percentage of *SCRIP* participants have completed the surveys and we are unable to determine the differences between the group of participants who completed and returned the surveys and the group of participants who did not.

From the inception of the *SCRIP* through January 2008, seventy-one program satisfaction surveys have been completed and returned from the *SCRIP* participants. Their responses indicate a high level of satisfaction with the reentry classes and with the services they were provided while participating in the prison portion of the program. The participants' responses indicate that 96% of them received release planning case management services. Transition teams to discuss the participant's release as well as meetings with the police officer liaison prior to release were reported by 86% of those who completed the surveys.

Twenty four percent of those responding believe that the most helpful service received while in prison was case management about release planning and also found that the transition team meetings to discuss release were helpful. Eighty-six percent of the respondents reported that the Shawnee County Reentry staff was available when needed. More than 66 percent of the respondents noted their overall experience with the Reentry program was “excellent”, “very good”, “great”, or “perfect”.

A satisfaction survey is administered again when the participant completes the community portion of the program or ends their involvement with the *SCRIP*. As of January, 2008, only seven of the *SCRIP* participants has returned a completed community satisfaction survey and their comments are therefore not summarized here but instead will be incorporated into a future report when a critical mass of post-program surveys have been collected. The KU evaluation staff recently received approval to implement a revised satisfaction survey that utilizes a Likert rating scale. This revised survey will give the reentry staff and the evaluation team more specific information about each participant’s opinions about the usefulness of individual classes and service interventions and an assessment of his/her overall satisfaction level with the programming received. The revised surveys are being distributed by the Reentry staff at the present time.

Discussion

The *SCRIP* is the original Kansas reentry program and in part because of its trailblazing role, has experienced a fair share of staff turnover and trial-and-error processes since its establishment. Even so, each of the three (including this report) *SCRIP* evaluations submitted to date provides findings that suggest the program is achieving at least modest success.

Specifically, each of the last two evaluation reports contain findings that participants who complete the full reentry program fare well on the ultimate outcome measures of violations, new charges and returns to prison. This report underscores those findings. Here, while there was an overall recidivism rate of 23 percent among those who had any participation in the *SCRIP*, when viewing the records of those who completed the entire *SCRIP* program (pre-release and full community component), the recidivism rate is 3 percent. For those who completed the pre-release portion but only some or none of the community component, the recidivism rate is 43 percent.

When looking in detail at the *SCRIP*, several findings from the analysis are worth discussion and consideration for program modification. First, the relatively low levels of social support that participants identify having are of concern, particularly upon release. At entry into the reentry program, about 36 percent of *SCRIP* participants indicated having a significant other (see Table 1). Between program entry and 30 days prior to their release, five percent of these participants reported having the support of a spouse upon reintegration to the community. This finding however, may be the result of the way certain questions were asked and thus an effort will be made to standardize the questions asked regarding social support. Participants most commonly anticipated the support of family upon release, listed by 39 percent of the participants. Surprisingly, at release, the second most common support anticipated by *SCRIP* program participants was Alcohol Anonymous and / or Narcotics Anonymous groups. Nearly nine percent thought they would have support from a community mental health center; only about five percent of participants anticipated having spousal support once in the community. These key indicators of social support may have a bearing on participants' success on various outcome measures, including on housing stability, employment and recidivism markers.

In addition to social support, participants are also asked or evaluated for the assets they would have at the time of their release. The most common assets secured were a form of identification (45%) and / or a birth certificate (25%). Most *SCRIP* program participants (34%) anticipated using the bus system as their primary method of transportation upon release. These particular asset areas may require additional focus by program staff in order to optimize participants' supports upon release.

Those participants in the *SCRIP* who are parents have a mean number of three children and there is a relatively low percentage (34%) of participants identified as have existing child support obligations. This may be related to gender, since most of the women in the Kansas reentry programs are enrolled in the Topeka program and women in general are less likely to be mandated to pay child support. Additionally, these women may no longer retain their legal parental rights but when asked about the number of children they have, may still rightfully claim their offspring.

Only 11 percent of *SCRIP* participants admit to having a history of domestic violence charges as perpetrators or experiences as victims. Research has long indicated a strong relationship between the experience and the perpetration of domestic or intimate partner violence and later incarceration. It may be that this history is underreported or is not officially recorded on any of the documents which may serve as sources from which these data are gathered.

In the *SCRIP*, an assessment for substance abuse was a service used by nearly 40 percent of all participants. An assessment for mental health was very rarely completed (fewer than five participants). These data seem at odds with the mental health codes assigned them while incarcerated (see Table 1). Most of the population was assigned codes indicating that the participant "may require time-limited MH services" (49%); requires ongoing mental health

services and/or medications (18%); requires special needs treatment (18%); or requires reintegration at the Larned Mental Health Correctional Facility (2%) or the Lansing Treatment Unit (13%).

The reentry planning class was completed by 64 percent of the *SCRIP* participants and the other frequently completed classes or workshops include Money Management (43%), Employment (40%), and Housing (29%). Over 20 percent of those referred to the cognitive skills class either never attended (17%) or attended and did not complete the class (4%). The *SCRIP* director and staff may want to reevaluate both the content and the benefit of offering certain classes / workshops which have a low level of participation (child support, some employment classes, and some education classes). It may be that the folding in of the content from less used courses into the more well attended classes could free up staff time to build the curricula of those other substantive offerings. At the same time, the recidivism findings presented here suggest that the maximum efforts should be placed in providing case management services – those detailed, purposive individual contacts between case managers and offenders that have to do with creating the personal and environmental conditions for a successful return to the community.

In sum, the 3 percent recidivism rate among participants who completed the entire *SCRIP* is encouraging as is the overall recidivism rate of 23 percent among persons who had any level of participation. The absence of a statistical relationship between most demographic and criminogenic or mental health issues and program outcomes means that program components are more likely to influence the ultimate outcomes than are participants' personal characteristics.

The recidivism rate among persons in the comparison group is considerably higher (24%) than among the full program completers, but is lower than for partial completers of the *SCRIP*.

Again, the reader is cautioned that the level of scrutiny under which *SCRIP* participants live may account for some of this difference. It is curious that those who returned to prison were more likely to have taken the Cognitive Class and/or talked to their case manager individually about cognitive concerns, than were or had successful participants. This finding should be investigated in the light of the relevant research that suggests the dosage and duration of the intervention and the level of participant readiness may all have an impact on the success of cognitive restructuring.

The finding that a meeting with a Transition Team at either six months or 30 days prior to one's expected release is highly significantly related to lower recidivism rates is important. It clearly introduces a level of social support (and personal accountability) that these participants may not otherwise have or identify as having. Further, the Police Liaison is involved with the Transition Team as well. It may be that the introduction of the police officer is powerful because the officer is someone who will serve as both helper and watcher as the participant makes his/her way back into the community.

Finally, program participants who avoided returning to prison had spent an average of two months longer in the *SCRIP* than had those who returned to prison. At present, the length of in-prison program time is approximately 12 months and the length of community program time is six months. As the number of participants increase it will be important to study whether the difference is associated with one program segment more than another. In other words, will positive outcomes improve if participants remain in the in-prison program or the community program for longer periods of time?

Conclusion and Next Steps

Not surprisingly, the more participants that enter into the Kansas reentry programs, the more challenging the data collection, analyses and interpretation become. These are good challenges and over time will likely lead to an increase in understanding about what specific interventions are most likely to help offenders successfully reintegrate.

The Kansas Department of Corrections continues to emphasize through its training initiatives the skills required for the productive case management of all inmates who are or will be returning to the community. The data system designed for the reentry program evaluations is capable of supporting the case managers in providing beneficial case management services. On any day a case manager can check the record of any participant and determine, for example, his / her status relative to class enrollment and process, anticipated and needed social supports, needs for health, mental health, and substance use assessments and interventions, and outcome status. From our bird's-eye view of the reentry programs, we believe that being able to access up-to-date information on a participant's progress is not only great for the case management work to be done but great for building a relationship with an offender; one that says "I am concerned enough about your success to make sure I know what you have accomplished and what you still need to accomplish to make that success a reality."

The ongoing evaluation of all of the KDOC's reentry programs will continue, with a particular emphasis on the relationship between overall program exposure and the ultimate outcomes of violations, new charges and returns to prison at 6, 12, 18, and 24 months post-release. In addition, as the data allow, we will look in detail at exposure to specific program interventions and those ultimate recidivism outcomes, in an effort to help the KDOC to identify and support "what works" in reentry programming.

There are other specific analyses we hope to pursue as well. As a critical mass of women participants builds, we believe it is important to focus some evaluative attention on gender related outcomes. The correctional literature is building in this area: women offenders respond differently than men to different program structures, content and methods of delivery.

Over time staff will become more comfortable with recording data and we hope to encourage their development in this area by continuing to make the data time-relevant and user friendly. As the consistency, reliability and integrity of the data improve, we hope to be able to connect the LSI-R domain scores with specific interventions, so that case managers and other staff will be able to know with some certainty, the efficacy of a particular intervention. At the same time, more specific information will allow for enhancements in course curricula.

We are working towards operationalizing the case management contacts so that the case manager can document all of the substantive contacts s/he has with a participant and, as part of the evaluation, we can determine which substantive types of contacts have the most beneficial effect. The operationalization of these contacts will take some time, since clear contact definitions are critical to the ultimate integrity of the data.

Similar explorations into the impact of stable housing on offenders' success over time as well as the effect of having / not having certain family and community supports on ultimate outcomes will be accomplished.

Finally, based on the full year data from each of the reentry programs, we are identifying certain variables that will allow us, through the KDOC data system, to secure equivalent comparison groups for each reentry program. We are well aware that the veracity of the findings of these evaluations rest on the ability to present them in comparison to persons with like

demographics but who have not had the specific interventions of a formal reentry program.

These comparison group analyses will be included in the next annual report.